

REMARKS

Initially, Applicant notes that by this amendment the specification has been modified to correct grammatical errors. At page 4, lines 5-6, the reference to “a stroke operation ... being inking” was modified to reflect that “[I]n response to a stroke operation, the system may...perform inking.” In the paragraph starting at page 10, line 17, the originally filed specification makes clear that if the answer to the question of whether “the stylus is still in contact with the digitizer when a time threshold had expired” is no, then “the system classifies the input as a tap.” Thus, the parenthetical “(meaning that the stylus was not still in contact with the digitizer surface)” has been modified to recite “(meaning that the stylus was not still in contact with the digitizer surface).”

Claims 1-27 remain pending. Claims 1-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Moran et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,404,439) (“Moran”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. Claims 1, 16 and 25 are hereby amended.

Claim 1 recites a method for operating a digitizer including a step of “classifying the user input by using at least one of a time threshold and a movement threshold.” The Office Action provides that “classifying the user input by using at least one of a time threshold [is taught at]col. 17, lines 25-35.” Moran discloses, however, a “TIME-SPACE OBJECT CONTAINMENT FOR [A] GRAPHICAL USER INTERFACE”, described in the abstract as an “invention [that] helps the user of a graphical user interface more easily select a group of objects that are meaningfully related to each other” by adding a temporal component to the object selection analysis of the invention. At column 17, line 25 through column 18, line 52, Moran discloses that each graphical object has a time associated with it as a property, such as time of creation or modification, and that objects that were missed or only partially included within a circular wipe stroke for selecting displayed objects, may be added to the list of objects selected by the stroke based on the associated time property of the object.

A

Thus, at best Moran discloses the selection of objects using a stroke, in a wiping mode, based in part on the time property associated with objects. Moran fails to disclose the option of “classifying” user inputs using “a movement threshold” or “a time threshold.” Indeed, Moran discloses the use of buttons or icons “along the left screen edge to establish pen functions” including the “wipe mode” (column 4, line 61 through column 5, line 38), and thereby obviates the need for classifying user inputs based on a movement or time threshold. ①

For at least these reasons, the features of claim 1 are not disclosed by Moran.

Additionally, Moran makes no mention of classifying a user input based on a “movement threshold” or based on a “time threshold.” No mention is made of either type of threshold or their use in classifying an input. The “time” component associated with an object, as described in Moran at column 17, is used as a property to select one or more objects, rather than to classify an input. Accordingly, Moran fails to disclose every feature required by independent claim 1 as originally filed.

Moreover, claim 1 has been amended to recite more clearly that the digitizer is capable of measuring the duration of a user input and capable of detecting movement. While claim 1 as originally filed required the capability of classifying a user input based on a movement threshold or a time threshold, or both, the claim has been amended to remove any doubt that the method requires the capability of classifying based on a movement threshold and/or a time threshold. Independent claims 16 and 25, as originally filed and as amended, recite similar features. For the reasons provided, Moran fails to disclose every feature required by these independent claims.

Claim 2 recites, *inter alia*, “classifying the user’s input as one of a stroke, a tap, a hold, or a hold and drag based on at least one of the input satisfying a first move threshold, a time threshold, and a second move threshold.” As previously described, Moran fails to disclose classifying the user’s input based in any way on a movement threshold or a time threshold, for the reasons provided.

X

Nor does Moran disclose “classifying the user’s input as one of a stroke, a tap, a hold, or a hold and drag.” The Office Action cites to column 17, lines 25-35, column 5, lines 5-13, and column 7, lines 37-61 of Moran as disclosing the recited classifying step. None of the cited portions, however, disclose the step of “classifying” a user’s input, much less of classifying a user’s input as a stroke, a tap, a hold, or a hold and drag based on a time threshold. At best, Moran discloses activating a pen switch or button (column 5, lines 9-14), activities completely unrelated to classifying inputs based on a time threshold. Thus, the features of claim 2 are not disclosed by Moran.

Independent claims 9, 17 and 24 require, at a minimum, “classifying the user’s input ... based on at least one of ...a movement threshold and a time threshold” and “classifying the user’s input as one of a stroke, a tap, a hold, or a hold and drag,” in a manner similar to that of claim 2. For the reasons provided with respect to claim 2, Moran similarly fails to disclose every feature required by these independent claims. Accordingly, Moran fails to disclose every feature of claims 9, 16, 17, 24 and 25.

Each of independent claims 1, 2, 9, 16, 17, 24 and 25 require “classifying the user input by using at least one of a time threshold and a movement threshold,” or similar language. As noted, Moran fails to disclose “classifying the user input” based on comparisons to such thresholds. Thus, the features of claims 1, 2, 9, 16, 17, 24 and 25 are not disclosed by Moran.

Independent claim 10 requires “determining whether said stroke input started on a draggable object.” Independent claim 11 requires “determining that said stroke input did not start on a draggable object.” Moran fails to address determining if an object is “a draggable object.” Accordingly, the features of claims 10 and 11 are not disclosed by Moran.

Independent claim 13 requires “determining at least one of whether a location of said tap includes wet ink, whether said location is in an inline space, whether said [tap] location includes a selectable object, and whether said object was previously selected; and performing at least one of adding a dot of ink, selecting said selectable object, placing an

insertion point in said inline space, or performing an action associated with said object.” Moran fails to disclose the recited determining. Although the Office Action states that each determining step of claim 13 can be found in Moran, at column 4, lines 15-60, Moran does not disclose any of the recited features within that excerpt, or otherwise. For example, no reference to “an inline space” can be found in Moran. Nor does Moran disclose any aspect of the claimed “performing” step. For example, Moran does not disclose “placing an insertion point in said inline space.” Therefore, the features of claim 13 are not disclosed by Moran.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 11, 13, 16, 17, 24 and 25 are distinguish over the art of record, and are in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 3-8, 12, 14-15, 18-23 and 26-27 are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims, and further in view of the various advantages and novel features recited therein.

Applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner feels, however, that further amendment and/or discussion may be helpful in facilitating prosecution of the case, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at the number appearing below.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher R. Glembocki
Registration No. 38,800

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 508-9100

Dated: January 31, 2003

AK